

### **REMARKS**

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending the claims so as to cancel Claims 1-51 and add new Claims 52-85. If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

The new claims are clearly supported by the present application. For example, each of the new independent claims recite that the first and second display devices are a liquid crystal display panel. This is supported by numerous places in the application, such as for example, page 3, last line to page 4, line 1.

New independent Claim 52 also recites the features of a CPU electrically connected with the second display device and a flash memory electrically connected with the CPU. These features are supported in the specification on page 22, particularly lines 5-24, and Fig. 12.

New independent Claim 60 also recites the features of a VRAM, a DRAM, and a memory card, and that the VRAM, the DRAM, and the memory card are electrically connected with the CPU. These features are also supported in the specification on page 22, particularly lines 5-24, and Fig. 12.

New independent Claims 68 and 77 recite the feature of a control circuit, wherein the control circuit distributes the image signal as data corresponding to each pixel in the second display device. These features are also supported in the specification on page 22, particularly lines 5-24, and Fig. 12.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and examined.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner now has the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

- A. Claims 24 and 26 are rejected as being unpatentable over Minami (US 6,967,632).

- B. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 21, 22, 25, 27, 34 and 35 are rejected as being unpatentable over Minami in view of Priestman et al. (U.S. 6,812,954).
- C. Claims 3 and 16-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Minami in view of Priestman and further in view of Mack II et al. (U.S. 6,510,325).
- D. Claims 19 and 23 are rejected as being unpatentable over Minami in view of Priestman and Gale et al. (U.S. 6,452,577).
- E. Claims 36-51 are rejected as being unpatentable over Minami in view of Nakai et al. (U.S. 6,072,454) and Priestman et al.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse these rejections, as explained above, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling Claims 1-51 and adding new Claims 52-85.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed device. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, the new claims, or the extension of time, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: April 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500  
Customer No. 26568